

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 AMANA GLOBAL COMPANY, a sole
11 proprietorship company, and HAFID
TAHROUI, an individual,

12 Plaintiffs,

13 v.

14 KING COUNTY, et al.,

15 Defendants.
16

Case No. C21-637-RSM

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
CLARIFY AND AMEND ORDER

17 This matter comes before the Court on pro se Plaintiffs’ “Motion to Clarify and Amend
18 Order Denying Second TRO.” Dkt. #33. Plaintiffs move for the Court to amend its prior Order
19 Denying Plaintiff’s Second TRO, Dkt. #32, “to an order denying second motion for TRO and
20 preliminary injunction and request for evidentiary hearing.” *Id.* at 1. In the alternative,
21 Plaintiffs move for the Court to “enter an order denying preliminary injunction and request for
22 evidentiary hearing or certify the order for appeal.” *Id.* Plaintiffs are seeking to immediately
23 get this case before the Ninth Circuit. *See id.*
24

25 The Court understands that Plaintiffs see this as an emergency situation and disagree
26 with the Court’s prior rulings to the contrary. Nevertheless, Plaintiffs are required to follow
27 this Court’s Local Rules.
28

1 The instant Motion is essentially another motion for reconsideration, although it is not
2 plainly labeled as such.¹ “Motions for reconsideration are disfavored.” LCR 7(h)(1). “The
3 court will ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the
4 prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to
5 its attention earlier with reasonable diligence.” *Id.*

6
7 Plaintiffs fail to point to any error in the Court’s prior Order and essentially ask the
8 Court to just create a new order denying a motion for preliminary injunction so Plaintiffs can
9 immediately appeal and get a different outcome at the Ninth Circuit. The problem with this
10 request is that, in the eyes of the Court, Plaintiffs have not yet filed a motion for preliminary
11 injunction. Unlike TRO motions, motions for preliminary injunction must be noted for
12 consideration on the fourth Friday after filing. LCR 7(d)(3). This gives breathing space for the
13 nonmoving party to file a response.
14

15 Every filing from Plaintiffs has been noted for same day consideration. The Court
16 denied Plaintiffs’ first TRO on May 18, 2021. Dkt. #17. Plaintiffs file a motion for
17 reconsideration, which was denied, and an appeal. The Ninth Circuit denied Plaintiffs’
18 emergency motion for injunction and Plaintiffs voluntarily dismissed the appeal. *See* Dkt. #33
19 at 2. On June 29, 2021, Plaintiffs filed an “Emergency Motion for a Temporary Restraining
20 Order and Preliminary Injunction Against Defendants and Request for Evidentiary Hearing.”
21 Plaintiffs noted this Motion for same day consideration, certified that notice was given pursuant
22 to LCR 65 (which only discusses TROs), and docketed the filing as “Second MOTION for
23 Temporary Restraining Order.” *See* Dkt. #27. Plaintiffs’ Motion discussed the law of TROs,
24 did not discuss facts or law related to the granting of a preliminary injunction, and concluded
25
26

27
28 ¹ The Court is supported in this conclusion by Plaintiffs’ noting of the instant Motion for same-day consideration.
To the extent Plaintiffs intended to file some other type of Motion they failed to properly note it for consideration
on the third Friday after filing. *See* LCR 7(d).

1 with “for the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court grants a
2 temporary restraining order until such time as the Court can further consider the merits of this
3 action.” *Id.* at 39. Given all of the above, the Court reasonably concluded that this Motion was
4 not a motion for preliminary injunction but either a motion for reconsideration or a second
5 motion for TRO. *See* Dkt. #32.
6

7 Given all of the above, and having considered the briefing and the remainder of the
8 record, the Court hereby finds and ORDERS that Plaintiffs’ “Motion to Clarify and Amend
9 Order Denying Second TRO,” Dkt. #33, is DENIED.
10

11 DATED this 2nd day of July, 2021.
12
13

14 
15

16 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
17 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28